

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,613,148) in view of Vanderbilt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,965). The Examiner also rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bezviner. The Examiner further rejected claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezviner et al. in view of Vanderbilt et al. and further in view of Holmes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,687,373).

Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes et al. in view of Bezviner et al. Claims 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes et al. in view of Bezviner et al. and Vanderbilt et al. The Examiner further rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman et al. in view of Holmes et al. and Bezviner et al. Claims 19, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman et al. in view of Holmes et al. and Bezviner et al. and further in view of Vanderbilt et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the cancellation of claims 1-27 and the addition of new claims 28-53, each of which is directed to at least one of two aspects that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

As to the first aspect, methods and systems in accordance with the present invention allow remote objects to be activated in a virtual machine in a process on a remote site. For example, claim 35 recites a method that receives a request to access an object, determines if it is active, and if not, activates the object in a virtual machine. The cited references, however, do not teach or suggest a remote object activated inside a virtual machine, such as a Java virtual machine.

As to the second aspect, methods and systems in accordance with the present invention allow for the creation and specification of remote object groups containing multiple remote objects on a single process on a remote site, wherein the objects in a remote object group may closely communicate with each other on the remote site. For example, claim 28 recites a method that receives a request to access an object in a group of objects, determines if the object is active, and activates, the "group of objects" when it is determined that the object is not active. The cited references do not teach or suggest this feature.

Applicant has searched the references cited by the Examiner and found that none of the references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teaches or suggests these two aspects. Since each of the newly added claims recites at least one of these two aspects, Applicant respectfully requests the issuance of a notice of allowance. Applicant also respectfully requests that the Examiner call Applicant's attorney if he believes it would expedite prosecution.

If an extension of time of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this Amendment, such extension is requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: 

Michael L. Kiklis
Reg. No.: 38,939

Dated: May 25, 1999